

LOUISIANA TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1998

Members present: J. Renea Austin, Bill Beyer, Senator Tom Greene, Tom Hagan and Butch Speer

Chairperson Renea Austin called the meeting to order. Marian Patterson called roll. Quorum was established. The first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes from the August 24, 1998, meeting. T. Hagan made a motion to approve the minutes. B. Speer seconded the motion. Minutes were approved.

R. Austin began the meeting by stating eight proposals would be presented. Each department had 15 minutes for their proposal, following questions by the Council members. After questions, the Council voted.

LSU-Baton Rouge (A Prototype High-Performance Computing System for the State of Louisiana)

First department to present was LSU Baton Rouge. Ron Hay, Executive Director of Computing Services introduced himself, along with other staff members--Claude Rodriquez, Dr. Emilio Icaza and Brian Ropers-Huilman.

R. Hay: This proposal was submitted to you from our staff in Computing Services. At the Computing Center at LSU, we employ about 130 people – a professional staff. We have state of the art networking technologies. We have the only digital backbone in this region. We have an ATM backbone that can move data at very high speeds which is absolutely critical to this kind of an application. Although we are on the Baton Rouge campus, we really are engaged in a lot of activities that benefit the entire higher education community. We are the first Internet 2 School in the State. We can represent our environment to be Year 2000 compliant. We have a very active security commitment and that's necessary to protect these kinds of resources from the thousands of hackers with no more to do than to try to penetrate these systems. We are also getting into high performance computing without this funding, but it's been a real slow go. Because we have gotten into projects that have been innovative in the past, it has really changed our organizational structure. You see in the heart of that organizational chart which represents our current umbrella structure – I might dramatize that we do work for Academic Affairs on the campus, my peers are the Dean, the Academic Deans and Academic Chairman.

The LOUIS Group is the library network for Louisiana. We are accustomed to growing in this service and then having it become an institutionalized service that is managed by LSU. I want to also dramatize that we're the traditional administrative computing center for a long time. AIS was our acronym, but that's now evolved to include services to 30,000 students and to 800 or more teaching faculty and the lot of the research communities are calling that group now the Enterprise Solutions Group and we see the need to move our traditional help desk and academic support group to an activity that we labeled high performance computing. That will happen with or without this funding simply because we have to have people like Dr. Gaza or Brian to meet

that research community head on with solutions and we do manage the network and we have a statewide help desk activity technology support center.

In 1993, we thought it would be a good idea for somebody in the state to provide leadership to automate libraries and coordinate all the technology necessary to support libraries. In 1990, we received a \$2.5 million federal grant with the Department of Education and we launched the library network. Since that time, we automated 20 of the university libraries in Louisiana and 64 parish libraries. In 1998, we will experience about 70 million on line library transactions. Put that on a daily activity volume that's about 300,000 on-line transactions a day. On peak days, we're expecting that to go to 450,000 transactions. What we're here to talk about today is taking basically the technology that's out there at LSU and extending its capability to provide parallel computing for researchers.

We use the SP or the parallel technology from IBM to support our on-line student customers. We don't have the engines and the server capacities to take on the research community with these very, very large research problems. We are asking for money to buy 12 SP engines or computers, the necessary bio services and some of the application servers that will make it possible for us to go out and solicit new business that the research community says they desperately want to address or have addressed. What we're arguing is that we can build on SP's we already have and the foundation technologies we already understand. We don't understand parallel computing very well, but the foundations are the same here.

We've launched new services that are enticing faculty to interact on almost a daily basis with Web enabled instructions and that's growing rapidly. We support the administrative functions not only at the Baton Rouge campus but also on 5 other campuses. More importantly, we've successfully become the service center for the Library patrons all over the State and on any given day that's potentially 4 million people. The Louis Project started with a \$180,000 grant from the 8g fund and to date we've generated over \$13 million of external grants and contracts. That concludes the comments that I've prepared and we'll try to answer the questions about the specifics in the project if you care to address those.

T. Hagan: I have a few questions. Are there other universities doing similar type projects out there that you are aware of?

R. Hay: I'm aware that CAL State now has what was the Cornell parallel computing resources. It was moved from Cornell to California. Some of the national labs have this technology and these consortiums of universities in the Chicago area have this technology and I think that's about it. Now the SP technology that the chart suggested is everywhere but it has not been pulled up and made available. The reason we think it makes sense to do this in Louisiana and some of our sister institutions have researchers that don't have access to resources, but we've got State agencies. One of them is right behind us -- The Oil Spill Coordinator's Office.

T. Hagan: Did you look at any other vendors as to what they are offering?

R. Hay: Yes. There are a lot of activities out there – the Desk Technology, the Silicon Graphics activity is out there. It may very well be that it makes sense for us to pursue. Our expertise and our install base right now is the IBM SP technology.

T. Hagan: I move that we fund the project up to the amount that was requested – \$989,383.00.

B. Speer: I second.

R. Austin: Any objections? Hearing no objections, this project will be funded at \$989,383.00.

R. Austin: Next presentation is by the Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office.

La. Oil Spill Coordinator's Office (Color-Infrared Digital Image Database)

R. Guidry: I am the Director of the Oil Spill Coordinator's Office. With me is David Gisclair, Director of the Technical Assistance Program in the Oil Spill Coordinator's Office.

R. Guidry: We'll try to satisfy specific needs across multiple State agencies with one proposal. We'll satisfy a wide array of state, local, federal and private mapping needs as indicated in the letters of support. This will capitalize on the new USGS Innovative Partnership Program. The proposal has almost a 2 to 1 federal dollar match. It will put Louisiana in the top 1% having completed statewide Color-Infrared Red Digital Image coverage. We will be the first State to disseminate a Color-Infrared Digital Image Data Base by Internet technology with a quick turnaround time.

Basically, our presentation consists of three parts – a description of the project, a demonstration of the products, questions and answers. The project consists of 1971 Color-Infrared Digital auto port log and covers the areas north of 30.5 latitude. Currently there are no CIRDOQQ's which exist in the current project area. The CIRDOQQ's meet or exceed the USGS National Ariel Photography Program and National Digital Auto Program specifications. Many state agencies and local governments will use the CIRDOQQ's. These agencies will use the CIRDOQQ's in several ways as indicated in letters of support.

Finally a brief explanation of the project implementation will be discussed. This is a list of the agencies which will use the image database and assisted in the compilation of this proposal. There will be many others that will join. The way you implement this project is to capture the CIR photography. The next step is to create the digital autos and once the autos are constructed, storage of the on-line image data base will be quite large. However, we have found an image compression tool which will solve the storage problem.

First the Color-Infrared Photography. Approximately 10,000 exposures were captured between January 1, 1998, and March 12, 1998. This required the use of 4 aircraft to cover the entire state under unusual adverse conditions. All 56 rolls of film came from the same Kodak master roll. All of the photography was photographed in pressurized aircraft using the same make and model

of cameras in this case while RC 30's were used. Over 98% of the film has passed USGS review. The remaining 2% will be flown this winter.

These are the DOQQ'S innovative highlights. This translates into approximately 500 gigabits for a 3,479 CIRDOQQ's. Search for a compression solution to the storage problem and discovered the multi-resolution seamless image data base tool commonly dubbed as Mr. Sid. Mr. David Gisclair will present the next portion of our presentation.

D. Gisclair: As Mr. Guidry had indicated, there are 1,971 DOQ's that are going to be produced out of this project. When combined with the Southern half of the State, we will have 3,479 DOQ's high-resolution imagery. What I'd like to demonstrate are two basic things that this imagery will do--#1 it will allow us to map surface features that we could not map before without having to go to ground with GPS. In regard to oil spills, this is a big consideration. We have thousands and thousands of production facilities in Louisiana. One of our big problems is mapping them. It would take an enormous amount of manpower to map this kind of information if we were using GPS on the ground.

In conclusion, I'd like to reiterate again that this project, this portion of the project, is being funded almost 2 to 1 by the USGS. This is a \$2.8 million project that's going to cost about \$1 million. In this case, this product is going to be used by multiple agencies and essentially this proposal is from at least a dozen different agencies that all need this kind of spaciousal information.

B. Beyer: Do you intend to make this information readily available on the Web?

D. Gisclair: We have funding to fund the servers that we need to actually put this information on the Web. Also, we have other sites that are proposing to put this same information so that there will be more than one site that this information could be distributed from. We think that there's going to be a high demand for this information. I'm getting calls from real estate agents, other state agencies and local governments as to when this product is going to be available. We would like to put this information on as many sites as possible.

B. Beyer: You have some public domain software that's available for general use?

D. Gisclair: That is correct. The original GOTIFF files are uncompressed and we intend on distributing that information via CD ROM. The compressed images that we can transmit over the Internet will be 3-megabyte files and those are the type files that we would like to put out on the Internet. The tools necessary to view this are definitely freeware.

T. Hagan: I would like to offer a few comments. I think that this is a very innovative project. It is one in which my agency, DEQ, has a tremendous stake. It is something that we need very badly. I will say that I would like to abstain from voting today because I have a vested interest in this and seeing that it's -- not that we're putting up the dollars, but that we will benefit probably as much if not more than the other state agencies. I would like to urge the support of the Council because I think it will be a tremendous asset to the State.

B. Speer: Madame Chair, members of the Council, I would like to echo what Tom said. This particular application of GIS data is something that is badly needed by the State of Louisiana and it would put us, as stated in their proposal, at the very front of the pack nationwide. I have a problem in that this does not meet the criteria for the Innovation Council funding. We are set up to provide seed money to State agencies to allow them to venture into uses of technology that they otherwise don't have the ability or the funding to venture toward. What you are doing is asking for continuation funding on a project that you've already begun. This presentation should be made to the Legislature in the budget process. The governor, the Commissioner of Administration and the Legislature didn't set this fund up to be continuation funding for a project, which is what you're asking us to do. Even though I find this is meeting the criteria of innovation, I view this as something that desperately needs to be done and funded, I cannot under the guidelines of this fund, support using this particular pot of money.

I sit on this Council as a representative of the Speaker of the House. Whatever I can do to make sure that whatever he can do to assist you in finding funding through the legislature appropriation process will be done so that you can finish this project. You didn't list the legislature in your use of this proposal, but the information the legislature will gain from this and the uses that all those other agencies are going to put this information to is mind boggling. I certainly regret that we are not set up as a continuation funding mechanism. This would be the easiest vote in the world if it were, but we're not and I must register my objection and make a motion that we not approve this project.

R. Austin: Any additional comments?

B. Speer: Could we talk a little bit about has this money been requested from the legislature and denied? I'm personally not aware of the history of this request. Can we talk a little bit about that?

D. Gisclair: In the past we have made some requests. We've talked with the Governor's Office concerning this project and essentially what was stated to us is that this was not a high enough priority project for the Governor's Office. We did try to go that route and that's what brings us here today. I would like to add in terms of a continuation project, the first question I ask is does this information exist. Is this high technology? I think the answer is yes. It is a way to use high technology to solve some of the extremely complex spaciuousal problems that the State has. Since it doesn't exist, I don't see it as a continuation project. The question is do we get this kind of information to better manage and plan in government or we don't. We've tried it the other way before and we did not gain the right kind of support to fund it. The other problem is that the way this is setup is time. Each day that goes by this imagery gets older. If we don't fund this at this point and we have to wait to go through the legislative process, we will be in less of a position to offer what I would consider to be current information. Not only that, we would definitely lose the federal funding. There are some time limitations in that realm also.

B. Speer: What are those time limitations?

D. Gisclair: June of 2000, I believe.

B. Speer: If federal funding is available until June of 2000, then you've got two legislative sessions to seek the appropriation of the money. In my experience working in the legislature, I do not remember when we did not have a supplemental appropriation bill between 25 and 50 million dollars to state agencies who had needs in a fiscal year that was about to end. Certainly for the past 15 years that has happened. I certainly am regretful that we set out the criteria for the use in the fund both in the act itself and in our internal working rules that would prevent me from voting for this. As I said, it's certainly more than worthwhile, more than innovative and is a crying need for the State. That's not what this fund is for. If we are going to begin using this fund for continuation funding in the IT area, there are a lot of State agencies that have been discouraged from seeking funding because they didn't meet the criteria. I understand your needs. There are ways to meet this. As I told you, whatever I could do with the Speaker of the House and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee on behalf of the House Representatives to insure that this is funded will be done. This is not the appropriate method for doing that.

R. Guidry: Last year we went to several meetings and we presented some of the material. Everybody was impressed, everybody wanted it, but we could not get one senator or one representative to introduce any legislation.

B. Beyer: I come from a different perspective from Mr. Speer. Clearly there are some continuation issues that are important, but this is really an outstanding project and from my perspective with the time urgency and the federal fund matching fund opportunity, I am very comfortable supporting this project.

R. Austin: I have to unfortunately agree with Mr. Speer. Although I do agree with him that this is a truly innovative use of technology, it does not meet the guidelines of the fund. I was very torn on this proposal. It clearly states in your proposal that this is Phase 2 of an ongoing project. You stated that it is not a continuation, but in your proposal itself, you say that this is Phase 2. You already have Phase 1 completed of the South part of the State. I understand your point in that it is the northern half of the State, but nevertheless a continuation of an ongoing Statewide project.

The Council may wish to address this particular issue and review our guidelines for the future because we are running into the problem with the definition of innovative use of technology, but they are not meeting the established criteria.

R. Austin: We have a motion on the floor to reject this proposal. Is there a second?

T. Hagan abstains. R. Austin seconds the motion. B. Beyer objects.

R. Austin: We will have the roll call.

The vote to reject the proposal was B. Beyer-no; T. Hagan-abstain; R. Austin-yes; and B. Speer-yes.

R. Austin: Two to 1, the motion to reject has passed.

R. Austin: Next proposal is the Department of Labor. They have two proposals.

Department of Labor (Thin-Client Implementation)

R. Jindal: I'm Raj Jindal, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor. With me is Charles Jumonville, IS Director; Jane Boettcher, Technical Services Manager; Lynn Templeton, Confidential Assistant to the Secretary, and Larry White, Assistant IS Director.

Our first proposal is THIN Client Implementation. The Louisiana Department of Labor has 35 local offices that are spread throughout the state. In each of these offices, we serve clients who come to find jobs and get help with their unemployment and insurance benefits. A lot of our applications are out on the Web and we get the job orders from the employers and are forced to do the job listing on the Web. In the reception area of the local offices, we have what we call the source center where they have access to these jobs and the other services available to them on the Web.

The employees have computers that are 15-20 years old and do not have access to the Web. What we are proposing is to replace each one of those non-programmable workstations with intelligent workstations. It is just a logical unit and it would be all networked. The main server would be at the Baton Rouge Administrative Office. We would be able to provide better services to our clients because all of the employees would be using the same technology as is available to our clients. In this day when everybody is using the email capabilities, many of our clients and employers want immediate answers. They want the privacy act through email. That service is not available to our employers and we will make that available to our employees. Charles Jumonville will expand on that area.

C. Jumonville: As Raj said, the THIN Client is certainly new technology. When we looked at it we had difficulty finding very many people using it. I brought one to show you what it looks like. Instead of a PC it is a little black box. Throughout the state, this box connects to the main computer center in Baton Rouge where we would have application servers and data servers. After the actual keystrokes are entered from the various sites, the data is received in Baton Rouge, and relayed to the site wherever it is throughout the State. As Raj said, the big point of this is it moves our people a tremendous way from where they are today in that it will actually jump pass the PC market and get to the network computers from the 3270 terminals that we had in the past. So it moves them ahead greatly. It will also give our people that are dealing with the public more time to deal with the public instead of having to worry about dealing with computers, computer problems, learning computing administration and backup and taking care of the configuration of computers. All that time can be spent with the public and that's where those people need to be spending their time – helping the clients that they serve, whether it's the employers of Louisiana coming to list their job openings, employees looking for jobs or a combination of employers and employees looking to train our work force. That's what we want our employees to do. We want them to spend time with our clients and we want them to use the latest computer services that are available in the most efficient manner.

T. Hagan: THIN client is something that's been out there for a period of time and I just did a little research and found there's probably about 7 million of these installed worldwide. Some companies are putting a lot of dollars into developing the THIN Client further. One of the companies is Wise Technologies. I just recently saw some demonstrations of that. I think I understand what you are attempting to do although in the case of this being truly innovative I guess I'm missing something in that. Can you explain to me how this is truly innovative technology?

R. Jindal: When we started looking at it in the Spring in regard to hardware and software, we had to wait for software to come out before we could actually get it. True network computing has been around and there are some installed worldwide, but the network computing to this level or worldwide is really just something becoming available to us this past summer.

B. Beyer: Based on our discussion with the previous request, we need to deal with the issue. According to my notes, this is a completion of a project that's already started. Can we talk about that?

R. Jindal: We just started. It will take more than \$3 million to implement the project throughout the agencies and we were able to just come up with about \$1 million in the agency. We are in the process of implementing in 10 local offices. We have completed 3 local offices already. We are requesting additional funds -- \$1 million -- to implement in some more local offices in order to have the Statewide agency wide implementation. I would like to point out that we did request funds from the legislature, but we were denied.

B. Beyer: Based on the continuation issue and based on Mr. Speer's remark from the previous one, this looks to me to clearly be a continuation and outside the scope, so regretfully I'm going to make the motion that we do not fund this one because it's continuation.

B. Speer seconds the motion.

R. Austin: It's been motioned and seconded that this project not be funded at this time. Any objection to that motion? Hearing none, funding is rejected for this proposal.

Department of Labor (Video Conferencing)

R. Jindal: Our second proposal is Video Conferencing. As we stated in the prior proposal, we have local offices and customers located throughout the state. In order to effectively manage the offices, our Secretary of Labor travels through the State meeting the employers, the employees of the agency and just bringing out the issues.

We are suggesting video conferencing be available in 10 offices -- 3 sites in Baton Rouge and 7 sites throughout the State so that the staff does not have to spend a lot of time in travel.

When there is a issue that is common to alot of employers throughout the State, we have to have a meeting with them together and the Secretary of Labor or his designees makes a presentation and addresses those issues. We are proposing we do video conferencing for these kinds of issues and there are many new things going on at the Department and the employees need a lot of

training on those issues. We plan to conduct training using the video conferencing as well. We think this is very innovative. Time is really spent effectively in providing services to the customers rather than just traveling.

J. Boettcher: As I'm sure you're aware, this offering is sponsored by OTM and BellSouth. They just recently made this available to State agencies. We have, along with the universities, probably one of the best opportunities to take advantage of this. We do have offices throughout the State and we have a need to be able to meet employers from throughout the State, show them the facilities we have and encourage them to do business with us. This provides us an opportunity with research and offerings from BellSouth and OTM and we would like to take advantage of that with your help.

B. Beyer: I spoke with the Board of Regents about their distance learning initiatives and they were very enthusiastic about these requests because it provided more capacity in the State for these types of application. Can you distinguish this project or differentiate it from the other distance learning capacity that we have in the State at this time?

J. Boettcher: We are not participating in any distance learning and do not have any distance learning capabilities at our offices which is where we want to implement this. This is the vehicle that we have available to us to implement that to get it to our office.

T. Hagan: I think one of the things Bill is speaking of is not only has the education system at LSU and higher education moved toward distance learning, but also there was a project where the military department is setting up major video conferencing centers in each one of its National Guard armories throughout the State. Many of those are located in a very close proximity to where your offices are located. If these things are going to be used for meetings as such and bringing employers in and so forth, then perhaps there should be some sharing of those facilities. One of the things they mentioned was these facilities would be available to other State agencies. It was a truly innovative project in the context in which they presented and I think is a rollout of looking for additional funding to do some of the same sort of projects. I would like to know if you have discussed this with any of the other agencies that are doing this?

R. Jindal: I don't think we have looked at some of those things at this point and we were not aware they had offered the facilities to the State agencies.

T. Hagan: Have you coordinated this request through OTM?

R. Jindal: Yes.

T. Hagan: OTM should be making you aware of other facilities that are going in and we should try to leverage off of those things that we have.

B. Speer: It was just mentioned to me that the Governor actually has formed by Executive Order, a Distance Learning Task Force. Once the task force is appointed and begins meeting, hopefully it will attempt to coordinate all the different efforts of state agencies and higher education to take advantage of the BellSouth/OTM compressed video backbone.

This will be the third or fourth time we've been asked to invest in Distance Learning. I have reservations that we are going to randomly create sites that have equipment in them that are going to be used for such limited uses. We have the possibility of creating thousands of Distance Learning sites where there is no coordination for their use and there's no multiple scheme or vision for those. I hope we can avoid that.

I have a question as to whether the sites you have chosen throughout the State actually have a room that is appropriate for this. Do you actually have conference rooms in Houma, Alexandria and Crowley that you will be able to use for these sites? This is not something you just throw up in an office somewhere and make it effective.

R. Jindal: The sites we have chosen are the big offices and there are conference rooms because we gather the employment insurance claimants to give them presentations on their benefit rights.

B. Speer: You are also asking for two years funding for telecommunication expenses. As we have stated, the purpose of this fund is not to meet ongoing expenses.

It is supposed to be a seed fund for start up costs for innovative uses of technology. In requesting \$200,000 plus, you are asking us to fund your ongoing expenses over a period of time. Even if we do approve this, I will certainly move that we not venture into funding any of the ongoing expenses such as your telecommunication line costs.

R. Austin: I have a question in regard to the budget office review of this. They indicated that there were some monies available for this purpose in a prior year and they were not spent and were returned to the State Treasury. Would you explain that?

L. Templeton: Our records show that \$92,400 was appropriated a couple of years ago for video conferencing and also worker's compensation. There was no one at the Department who knew off the top of their head what that was about so we did a little research. Apparently that was a last minute request that was put in. It was for a low class PC based system and the funds were appropriate but once they were appropriated and the Office of Worker's Compensation really started looking at it, they realized that the system they had proposed would not be adequate. The technology was moving very quickly away from that and the money was not used but returned to the State Treasury. The system that we are proposing before you today is for the latest technology. It is for the entire agency rather than just for one office.

T. Hagan: I would like to offer a motion that this project not be funded on the basis that through OTM and perhaps you should talk with the Military Department and see if there can't be some sharing of technology worked out in that arena. If not, I would certainly support going over to the legislature to assist in getting some monies, but I'm not sure that it totally meets the criteria for this fund.

B. Beyer: I reluctantly second that. We've seen three or four different proposals in Distance Learning and clearly there is a need in all of the State agencies, but the coordination issue is something that we should put on OTM to take control of that. I second the motion.

R. Austin: Any objections? Hearing no objections to the motion, this proposal will not be funded at this time. Thank you. Next presentation is by LSU Eunice.

LSU-Eunice (Extending the Campus Walls: Providing Anytime-Anywhere Access to Academic and Support Services to Improve Student Success and Satisfaction)

B. Nunez: I'm Bill Nunez, Chancellor of LSU at Eunice. With me is Ron Wright, Director of Information Technology on our campus. My job this morning is to give you an overview of the Eunice Campus. We are a campus of the LSU system, with 2,700 students enrolled this fall. We are one of the two public campuses that showed an increase in student population of five percent. Baton Rouge was the only other campus with a notable increase. We are one of two campuses in terms of marks of distinctions as reported by the Board of Regents that has 100% of its eligible programs fully accredited. We also have, I think, the third highest graduation rate in the State of Louisiana, second to LSU. Sixty-seven percent of our faculty have doctoral degrees.

We have a typical role and scope for a two-year institution--in this case, the LSU system. We deal with transfer students who are working towards completion of their law program obviously at a senior institution. Our occupational students who are career oriented who will enter the work force upon completion of their associate degree and of course the third portion of this comprehensive scope deals with preparing students to upgrade their skills for their job task as well as dealing with remediation. About 50% of our students are either occupational or oriented towards transfer. We are empowered by our mission to fulfill those particular responsibilities. We have a notable economic impact in SW Louisiana--about \$8 million in terms of monies that flow from the university.

I think the most important economic impact is our educated work force that we produce every year. Ron Wright will deal with some of the specifics here, but I wanted you to get some sense of the nature of our student body. We deal primarily with the region of Acadia--the 3 parishes of Evangeline, St. Landry and Acadia. We draw students from outside that tri-parish region and this is because we have a statewide mission when it comes to the program of Fire Science. Clearly those students are not commuting to LSU-Eunice. That's one of the reasons for this particular proposal.

R. Wright: In preparing this proposal, we go back about 18 months when we did several different activities on campus. One, we performed a marketing study. We looked at our strengths and weakness--why our students came to us and why they left us and what they wanted us to provide for them. A second area came up recently when the legislature started looking at performance funding for institutions and we were required to put together an accountability plan. In doing so, we outline several areas that we needed improvement and we hope to get there through this proposal.

The title of our proposal is Extending the Campus Walls. We're looking at providing anytime, anywhere access to academic and support services for the improvement of student success and satisfaction. We have two primary goals in putting this proposal together. The first goal is we want to create a single integrated online environment that will provide the student with anytime, anywhere access to institutional services. As Dr. Nunez pointed out, we have students throughout the State. We also have a large number of students that never come on our campus during regular business hours. They may be full time students but they never come between the hours of 8-4:30. They need access to the areas our normal 8-4:30 students have. We want to provide access to this information via kiosk, as well as the Internet to accommodate the needs of the varieties of students.

We will have the traditional on campus students--those that come to college, take their classes between 8-3 and generally leave in the afternoon. We have students at our off campus class locations. We teach a number of classes in Opelousas, Crowley and Ville Platte. That does not include our Distance Learning sites.

Fire Class Students--We teach Fire classes throughout the State at sites including Lake Charles, Baton Rouge, St. Martinville, Monroe, Winfield and Shreveport. As Dr. Nunez mentioned, we are the statewide designated provider of Fire Science instruction outside of metropolitan New Orleans. Due to Board of Regents Distance Learning initiative, many of our classes have moved to that format in the areas where it's accommodating. That brings us to another primary instance driving the proposal--ACP Students in High Schools. This is our advanced college program for students that are seniors in high school, have met the criteria for admissions to college which includes ACT scores, appropriate grade point averages. They are actually taking courses in their high school that are taught by credential instructors from the university and are receiving dual credit which is high school credit and college credit. This semester we're piloting this program in Chemistry, Introduction to Education, and the freshman level English courses. Currently, we have 15 students participating in that program, creating 51 credit hours at the university.

T. Hagan: Three different sites?

R. Wright: Yes--Eunice, Crowley and Opelousas. We've divided this into five areas—five distinct things we want to integrate and bring under one umbrella and give our students easy access to. One is student data. They need to be able to register for classes easily and be able to apply for admissions. They need access to their records, transcripts, and degree audits. All of this would be accomplished through an interface provided via the Web. It is becoming an every day instance.

The second area is easy, inexpensive voice communications. This is one of the truly, I believe, innovative aspects of the proposal. What happens if the student has questions and does not understand what they are supposed to do? The kiosk we're looking at providing has a handset just like a telephone. We are proposing using IT Telephony Gateway. It is a computer sitting on the Internet and allows the student to press a button on the screen. It will initiate a true telephone call. It will travel over the Internet through the Gateway on our campus and then dial the extension of the party they need to talk to complete their transaction. Any time these students have problems initiating their business, they are only a button away from actually

talking to somebody. One of the real exciting things about this is nobody incurs long distance calls. The Internet connection already exists and it's just a local call on our campus once it gets there.

Third Item – Integrated Email Conferencing and Course Interaction Facility. Many campuses you go to and it may even be in some of your offices, you probably have multiple user names, multiple passwords depending upon the systems that you try to access. You may have one for email, you may have an administrative information system in your office where you have accounting records. More often than not those are separate systems and require you to know multiple passwords and remember them. We are looking at providing all of these services, the Web base, the integrated email – all under one system that provides a single user name, a single log-in access to the student. We want to provide this service to them in as easy use fashion as possible.

Fourth Item -- to promote access to library and specialized computing resources. When LSU Baton Rouge gave their presentation earlier they talked about the LOUIS System. To access the LOUIS System you must be at a site – for certain data bases – you must be at a site that is a member. For example, if I wanted to search for bibliographic information and I'm an LSU-E student if I'm at home, I can't do that. I have to be on campus. The Gateway that we're proposing to institute this will actually allow them to be at home, funnel back through us and gain access to this information.

Fifth item is the development of the interface to actually tie this together under one umbrella. Our Administrative Information System is produced by a company called Car's Information Systems. They are from Cincinnati, Ohio. They've briefly introduced a Web access fleet which is being piloted at several of their partner institutions now. We're looking at using this as our primary access method. The second – the IT Telethany Gateway is from a company called Vocal Tech. Any of you that have had any contact with telecommunications – Nortell which is one of the largest providers of telephone equipment throughout North America has recently contracted with Vocal Tech. They are going to use their technology. The third item – the first class interactive classroom server. This is the mechanism that's going to pull the email, the conferencing, and the class information all together under one umbrella. This is designed for student use in an education environment. It says, "Look, send me the state the student wants." The application server then turns around, takes the data it gives it, formats it in a nice, easy to read format and sends it to the workstation. That's essentially what we're going to be doing there.

T. Hagan: In looking over your proposal. How does this proposal fit into the overall scheme of the entire LSU system?

R. Wright: What we're looking at is we want to provide a template, a module. LSU Baton Rouge has what they call PAUSE – access to student records and email. There's some interaction. The Board of Regents Distance Learning initiative – something like this is going to be needed on a Statewide basis to some extent. We have students on our campus that take courses at UNO on a regular basis. For them to transact business sometimes is cumbersome. This will be a module for those other institutions to take off and pursue something similar.

Senator Greene: You say that the size of the institutions lends itself to almost a pilot program and it would be good to go ahead and initiate it. I move that we approve the proposal.

T. Hagan: Second.

R. Austin: I just have one comment. In your proposal you listed some estimated recurring costs, ongoing costs. Does the university plan to incur those cost and absorb them within your existing budget?

Dr. Nunez: Yes we do.

R. Austin: Okay. It's been moved and seconded that the program be funded at \$176,422. Are there any objections to that motion? Hearing none, you will be awarded \$176,422.

R. Austin: Next presentation will be the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (Multimedia Project)

J. Patton: I'm Undersecretary with the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. This proposal will fund the use of innovative technology to make the scientific and educational resources of our department more readily available to all. This proposal will improve the effectiveness of State government and provide better service to the public. It will use state of the art technology. With me is Dr. Lyle Soniat, Director of Information and Education, Andrew Vaughn from the Information and Education section and David Dousay, Manager of the Information Systems section of the Office of Management and Finance

Dr. Soniat: We believe this request will help us overcome barriers to improve public service. By doing so, we've recognized that we will meet the needs for 3 distinct audiences-- school children, sportsmen, and tourism. For school children, one of the applications that we would like to be able to develop are chat sessions where we can develop a schedule linked to curriculum in Louisiana; for example sciences classes. If we can develop a weekly schedule where we will have a biologist present for a given period of the morning where that person could answer questions from a biology class, we would advertise the schedule in advance and let classrooms know around the State. For example, on June 15 we're going to be talking about turkey and deer management. We'll be talking about different species that would tie into science classes around the State.

For sportsmen we recognize that there would be demand for more information about wildlife management areas. The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries presently manages over 1.3 acres of public lands. We want to make those areas more accessible to the public, let the public know some of the natural resources that are available, some of the geological features, some of the unique areas so that we can draw the public to those places. They can be more aware of access and services. That would be the same for tourism, but in-state. People from out-of-state who are interested in visiting Louisiana could find out where boat landings were and they could get a

detailed map they could print on their home printer. They could get species information. Right now the information is there. We believe this is an innovative approach. It's a new application of using technology to package this information and to reach new audiences in better ways. This is a new program, not a continuation program. It is relatively inexpensive. We feel that the technology will last for many years and will enable us to provide greater information to the public. The demand is already there and we're gauging that by the phone calls that we get and the number of requests we receive for printed information. We feel this is a better way to overcome the barrier of getting information to audiences.

T. Hagan: Is there a commitment on the part of Wildlife and Fisheries to really expand this type of service? It's a modest request for money.

Dr. Soniat: Yes it is. That's evidenced by the fact that we've got over three different divisions working. We have the Office of Management and Finance, the Computer Office and my office. We have commitments from the biologists. Everyone recognizes that this is a better way for us to generate the type of public contact that we want to reach our constituents, to reach the public. It is a better way for us to serve the public.

This fund was available and it was appropriate. We felt that this project was certainly innovative in the sense that it is a new application of technology. We've presently got the information at the Department, and have the experts that have this knowledge

T. Hagan: What is the overall budget for Wildlife and Fisheries for technology?

Dr. Soniat: I'm not sure we have a budget for technology in this sense.

T. Hagan: Surely you have a budget within the Office of Management and Finance and you have identified what your IT costs are. You have a budget unit for that, don't you?

J. Patton: Yes we do, but actually this would not be within management and finance, this would be within the Office of the Secretary because that's where the information and education division is located.

T. Hagan: Most of this is equipment--communication lines, etc., would fall under your information systems department.

J. Patton: We haven't really determined who's going to have final responsibility for this equipment at this time.

Dr. Soniat: If we define innovation as an application reaching new audiences and providing them with additional services, we're not doing that as well as we can. This is a new way to do it and I feel that that certainly meets the description of innovative.

Senator Greene calls for motion to approve proposal. Butch Speer seconds motion.

R. Austin: It has been moved and seconded that this proposal be awarded. Without objection, this proposal will be funded at \$67,410.

R. Austin: Next presentation is the Department of Education with two proposals.

Department of Education (Videoconferencing Network)

C. Whelan: I'm Director of Educational Technology for the Department of Education. With me is Scott Mentor, our Educational Technology Specialist. Our proposal is to setup a live link via LCETnet. I would like to give you a little bit of background about where we are right now.

Louisiana has committed to educational technology over the past two years. As you are aware, the legislature approved the classroom based technology fund in July 1, 1997, and approved the spending of \$38.2 million and again funded it to the amount of \$25 million last year. Louisiana is continuing its commitment to improve education and to provide methods of communication to all of its constituents. Due to the large number of small and rural schools and the relative isolation of them, we are proposing this live link via LCETnet, a compressed video network throughout Louisiana to deliver educational and related services in a cost-effective manner. We've also used the LSU compressed video system last year and found that this system was very helpful in getting the message across without having to travel and without having the expense of the travel. Our goal is to deploy a compressed video network throughout Louisiana to deliver educational related services. We want to restructure the current educational delivery system and to develop a new vision of schooling through a distance telecommunication system that utilizes compressed video conferencing along with the Internet. We'd like to operationalize the collaboration of 20 districts. Right now we do have 6 districts that are involved in a pilot compressed video as the result of the remaining funds from the classroom-based technology. We feel that if we can expand this to an additional 13 sites and develop a consortium and an instructional handbook of web site and CD ROM as a result of this, we can have coordination across the State and share some of the resources we have. We feel that if we don't expand and get involved with this that we will continue to be behind and we will not be able to provide the information to our rural district areas and have more equity in our educational system.

As we've traveled around the State and as we've worked with distance education, many of the rural sites do not have and are not able to provide the courses needed for their students to qualify for the TOPS program. So we have an equity issue. The students in Sabine Parish or the school system of Sabine does not have enough certified teachers to teach all the courses needed. We believe that with this compressed video system we'll have a better service of delivery, we'll save money and we'll also be able to generate revenue. As I mentioned earlier, we currently have 7 LCETnet sites. This proposal is to establish an additional 13 sites with one located in the central business district, five in rural areas, four in suburban and three additional sites based on disparity. We would do this through an application similar to the proposal system that we've used for our classroom based technology fund and our federal fund.

The users would be the teachers, students, administrators, State government and technology coordinators. Just two weeks ago we met with the House Education Committee at our Center for

Educational Technology. Through the last year's compressed video initiative, we were able to communicate with students and administrators in Sabine Parish through this system. Across the State there are many areas that we still can not communicate with. What are the applications of this? The most important application is probably the student classes that will be able to be taught through this compressed video system. I think second most important is teacher training. With all of the new technologies in the classrooms now, teacher training is crucial. Without it, we will not see the differences that we need to see in order to get the results that we're looking for in order to move Louisiana off the bottom.

Some of the school systems would like to provide university courses through their neighboring universities especially out in the rural areas like Claiborne Parish where they have a number of uncertified teachers that need to continue their education. Another thing that is very important about this proposal is that we've worked with a number of partners in the development of it. We've been working with the Board of Regents and representatives from the LSU system. We've met with the National Guard on numerous occasions and they've shared their plan. We've talked about our future plan. We've worked with Telemedicine and Continuing Education departments. We feel that our role in the Louisiana Center for Educational Technology could be the coordinator for the K-2 and to coordinate with all of these other entities but to provide the center of coordination.

S. Mentor: The main piece of equipment that will be used will be the CODEC. It pretty much takes like a camera signal and actually digitizes it and actually compresses the video. Other technology would be the camera, the monitor for viewing the remote site, microphone, and the telecommunications that would be running a 384 kilobytes per second data stream between the sites. All the equipment has been put on State contract. There are three major vendors on State contract – Citritel, Vtell and NEC. This was all within an initiative that was started by the Board of Regents of bringing up 28 sites and we're just riding on their coattails.

C. Whelan: If we are funded we would advertise for 90 days. We would bring in outside reviewers to review the plan. We would go before the State Technology Advisory Committee which is already established that we've been working with for 2 years now and this Committee would make the recommendation to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. As far as the equipment goes, we would recommend the use of the equipment on State contract and we would set up the meetings for the interested parties to review what was available. We also would setup a consortium of all the people that are participating in the compressed video so that there would be coordination.

Senator Greene: Have you run this by Beth Courtney regarding your needs in Public Broadcasting?

C. Whelan: She is on our State Technology Advisory Committee and was not at the last meeting but her representative was and this was discussed. They are also going to have a compressed video site so they will be part of the consortium.

Senator Greene: I just want to make sure we're all using all the resources we have out there. I know LPB is doing that and I didn't want y'all operating independently.

C. Whelan: That's a great suggestion and they have a lot of expertise that we don't and we want to work together.

R. Austin: I have a question for clarification. In your proposal and even in your comments this morning, how many sites do you have available now? In the proposal it mentioned 5, 6, and 7. How many is it?

S. Mentor: Currently we have 7 sites.

C. Whelan: Including our center.

T. Hagan: I certainly applaud what you're trying to do but the technology innovation fund was set up basically to provide seed money for new projects. If this is continuation, I really don't think it fits the criteria of the fund itself.

B. Beyer: Can you differentiate this activity from the other work that's already started in the State?

C. Whelan: Last year we were working with the classroom based technology fund and we had \$355,000 left from the total amount because some of the non-public schools did not apply for their funds. We thought if we could start a pilot project so that we would know if we had the capability of carrying this out. We really did not know if we could do it. If we hadn't done this pilot we would not be able to really try to set it up across the State. Last year's was just testing the waters so to speak -- meeting with all the other entities, the National Guard etc., but we can't expand this without additional assistance.

R. Austin: Have you made a request for additional funding through the regular appropriations process for the continuation of this service for the additional sites that you'd like to do?

C. Whelan: No we haven't.

R. Austin: How were you going to fund the existing sites that you have?

C. Whelan: The existing sites have agreed through the application process and their superintendents have signed off on taking the ball and rolling. Basically this provided the initial equipment, setup for them. They have agreed through the proposal process to continue it.

R. Austin: The 13 sites that you are proposing would do the same thing as part of the proposal process that they would go through?

C. Whelan: Yes. We would provide coordination and training, etc. and they would carry the ball. That would be the understanding.

T. Hagan: Last year you said \$25 million was put into the technology initiatives for the State. You feel like this project could not be funded out of the monies the legislature will appropriate this coming year?

Senator Greene: In the past its been on a per student basis. They didn't have the option to do this on a statewide. Every school got so much money based upon the number of students and they had to have their plan. As far as the Statewide initiative, you couldn't use any of that money for that. That's why we were able to use a little bit that wasn't utilized-- \$355,000. So there's been a lot of money spent, but it went to individual schools based upon their student counts. You really couldn't use it to coordinate this. As far as how much we're going to have this year – it's going to be a tight year. Everybody's hearing rumors of that and I don't know how much we're going to get on that. We're meeting right now on trying to recycle computers, trying to get a lot more just from the computers that are out there in the State government.

R. Austin: You said that as a part of the proposal process to the local school boards that they would pay for the recurring costs of this program. You all would basically purchase the equipment for them.

C. Whelan: In the proposal, I think the first year.

R. Austin: Right. In the proposal it states something different. That's why I wanted clarification.

C. Whelan: I understood that we would pay the first year if this was approved to get them started and that throughout the year we would develop a process where they could actually generate their own revenues by renting this facility for other meetings, etc.

S. Mentor: It's part of the consortium that we're looking at. Actually there's two charges. One is a telecommunication charge. That's the actual line from your site, your premise to the BellSouth switching and then actual usage charge. What we are proposing the first year is pay both of those. The second year just pay the usage, more or less weaning them off on the second year. Right now the time lines under Universal Service Funds they were going to have to leave competitive bids to services using the State contract as one of their bids. The time line for that is now between December 1st and February 10th. They have an 80-day window that they have to make this application for next year's funding to be able to get the discounts under telecommunications. We talked to Tom Carroll at the SSC in New Orleans for TeEd and he said the usage fee is actually a service and should be eligible under the Universal Service Fund for discount.

R. Austin: What happens if one of the sites at the end of the second year can't assume the cost – what happens to that site?

C. Whelan: The equipment could be transferred to another site and another system could get the line charges and set up the lines to use it.

R. Austin: If they transferred at the end of two years they'd have to pick up the cost for the lines and everything themselves.

C. Whelan: My prediction is in two years there will be communication lines to every school. Our goal is to have T1 lines going to every school in the State, in every classroom actually.

B. Beyer: I'm trying to differentiate this proposal from the Labor proposal and certainly education is important and you've done a very good job. You've talked to the other people in the State that are already doing this. How does this differentiate from the Department of Labor's proposal?

S. Mentor: We've spent so much money in trying to provide computer access in our classrooms to our students and faculty and yet we're not getting as much out of that as we could. We've got a tremendous investment that we can get a lot more and I think that helps deliver the service most needed in this State.

B. Speer: Is the Department of Education eligible for 8g funding?

C. Whelan: Yes we are.

B. Speer: And I think in part of your proposal you indicated that part of last year or the pilot had been funded through some 8g funds. Have you made application for 8g funding for this part of it?

C. Whelan: No, but we are planning to. The application time has not come up yet and we will try to expand the Louisiana School for Math and Science Distance Learning Program to include the compressed video component.

B. Speer: Is there another phase that you're going to ask the 8g fund to buy into?

C. Whelan: No. We are planning to work with them on the development of the curriculum that goes out to the classes through this. Because they have the most experience in the State, they would be key people to work with. The development time takes time and expertise.

B. Speer: One of the concerns I have is for the department and school systems. There are other funding sources available for this type of technology development. There are times when money is available, but for the rest of State government there are limited resources. I would echo Mr. Beyer's remarks that this is a second phase and an ongoing project which is outside of the scope that we have established for this fund. One of the other things we said about using this fund is if there are other sources of revenue available, that because of the scarcity of the money that we have, those funds should be pursued to whomever they are available. In your case, you've got a bigger pot to ask for that is not open to everybody else and you are in a second phase of a program. I don't believe you meet the criteria for our funding.

C. Whelan: I think we will be a year behind if we wait a year for additional funds.

Senator Greene made a motion to approve the proposal.

B. Speer: I have to ask for a substitute motion that we deny.

R. Austin: We had a motion to approve. We have a substitute motion to reject. The vote will occur on the substitution motion, which is to reject.

Roll is called for the substitute motion. Vote is as follows: Bill Beyer-yes; T. Hagan-yes; R. Austin-yes; Senator Greene-no; B. Speer-yes.

R. Austin: With a vote of 4 to 1, this proposal has been rejected.

Our final proposal for the day is the Department of Education.

Department of Education (Document Management Project)

B. Franklin: I'm the Director of the Division of Planning Analysis and Information Resources within the Department of Education. Mr. Dave Elder, Assistant Director of our Information Technology Section will make the presentation.

D. Elder: Our main objective is to improve services to educational customers. Our pilot program will start with teacher certification and then the school division. We're preparing now for the new building move in the year 2001. This is significant because the building has a problem where enough space has not been allocated for the amount of filing cabinets that we currently have, let alone the expansion of any files we collect between now and the year 2001. We are coupling the power and the skill ability of our IBM System 390 mainframe with Windows Desktop. Our document management software will support the Internet access to documents which we will take advantage of in the future. Our customers in sections such as teacher certification, have asked us to help them design Web based application forms so that a teacher could, with a standardized form on their Web Site with perhaps bar coding in the bottom left hand, click on throughout their application form, send it to teacher certification and follow-up sending in their check for the certification process. We also intend to incorporate the use of electronic data interchange formats so that we can utilize this in the future for universities and colleges and school districts where we could exchange files electronically instead of receiving the tons of paper we receive today.

We are using a system that is also used for Public Safety and Revenue and Taxation. DOE exchanges documents with the following agencies: Civil Service, Lasers, Teacher Retirement, Group Benefits, Workers Compensation, State Purchasing, Contractual Review, Property Control, Risk Management, and State Treasurer. We intend for all these types of documents coming and going from these agencies to be incorporated into this document imaging system. Again, one of our goals at DOE first – Strategic and Operational Plan – is to improve customer services. It currently takes 4 to 6 weeks for teachers to receive their teacher certificate once they've started the process. We intend to improve that to 1 week or better as they learn the new

system. Our future plans include using the EDI format which will allow file receipt and exchange with universities and eventually colleges and school districts.

We are redirecting the use of our operation staff and we hope that within the next 2 to 3 years we intend to move them towards a more technical role in our communications and help desk areas. We also would eliminate redundant vendor document files. We're going to use the IBM System 390 Enterprise Service Solution that will provide our backup on 3 different media's of disk storage, optical server or DBD – automated tape library server. It will have optical server and tape library for backup files that can be recovered anytime they want and also used for disaster recovery. The image files and reports will be available for our user community on screen instead of waiting for reports to be delivered and the image files will be shared with any of the users that have a need to know that information. We want to eliminate as many of the filing cabinets as we can before the year 2001, allowing users to scan in their documents and to be able to access them and index them on their retrieval stations. They will be stored on the IBM mainframe, allowing the users to be able to retrieve them back to their desktops. We would require hardware and software. We will complete technical training by training not only our information systems staff but at least 15 users of each of the piloted divisions. All divisions have the potential to use this particular product. This document management system is utilizing our DBQ data base standard for the indexing. Conclusion of this project will allow DOE to share electronically imaged files with all of our internal and external customers. It would protect the future growth of DOE for data storage requirements with a long-range technology sound IBM System 390 Platform Solution.

Senator Greene: If I went to a school and wanted proof that 70% of their faculty were certified, they wouldn't have it at the school, correct?

B. Franklin: Until the teacher submits the appropriate paperwork, credentials and documents that are needed for certification, they are not legally identified as being a certified teacher in Louisiana.

Senator Greene: Is it a potential for someone to be assumed to be certified and they are not?

D. Elder: With this proposed system you would be able to do trend analysis because you'd have everything on-line. Currently they have 163,500 files that are active.

Senator Greene: Do you know how many teachers they have in the public school system?

B. Franklin: It's between 40 and 50,000.

T. Hagan: We've had a number of very similar requests that have come before the Council and to date we have basically turned all of those down because document management systems are not particularly innovative. There are a number of these projects going on in different departments right now. My own department has one going on very, very similar to what you're doing here. Natural Resources has a tremendous project going on that's being brought up on-line right now as well as the Department of Public Safety, and Revenue. We had

a request from the Attorney General's Office that was in the same category, as well as the Division of Administration. I would have to move that we not fund this out of the Technology Innovation Fund and perhaps try to seek funding for it in another manner.

B. Franklin: One of the problems that the teacher certification area has is that the funding for that area is very minimal. Most of the funding is actually paid for by the teachers themselves as they get certified. This was an effort to try and upgrade that process.

B. Beyer: I second Tom's motion. I feel that we've seen that the technology has permeated the State agencies and somehow the legislature has to find a way to help get that process going.

R. Austin: There has been a motion made and seconded to reject this proposal. With no objections, this proposal will not be funded.

R. Austin: That concludes the presentations this morning. Based on the action taken, we have awarded \$1,233,215 in proposals this morning.

As per Act 481 of 1997, we're to make a report to the legislature by March 30. We will be preparing that report with the assistance of Tom Burkes, who works for the Division of Administration. We need to set a cutoff date to send to the agencies to submit their information they are required to submit to us. Tom and I have discussed this and we've suggested Monday, March 1.

We will submit the report no later than March 30. We still have funds remaining in the Innovation Fund. Do we want to establish a cutoff date today for the next round of proposals or do we want to wait and set that later? We have not received any to date.

B. Beyer: Could we set it three months from now?

R. Austin: That would be the end of February and meet in March to hear proposals. next round of proposals and then after that a meeting date. Tom how long do you generally need, about 3 weeks?

T. Burkes: I need about three weeks to review and distribute each proposal.

B. Speer: Is the draft of the report going to be given to the Council for review before it's submitted to the legislature?

R. Austin: Yes and we can approve it at the March meeting.

B. Beyer: Don't the agencies that have received awards have an ongoing reporting responsibility back to us?

R. Austin: Yes they do and it is stated in the MOU.

T. Burkes: Agencies have to report twice on their progress.

R. Austin: The total amount requested today was \$5.9 million dollars and we awarded \$1.2 million. We had \$5 million. As of October 13 we had a fund balance of \$5.6 million. This was in addition to the \$5 million that we have available in fiscal year '99 which we do not have expenditure authority of, but it is available to us. In August we awarded about \$2.9 million.

The cutoff date will be February 22 for receiving proposals. We will meet on March 24. At that time we will review the report to the legislature and finalize it as well. That report will encompass the awards that have been made and the reports they will have to make to us as well.

I had one other item that I wanted to discuss. It's still not very clear even though we made modifications to the guidelines at the last meeting, to agencies the innovative picture we're trying to paint and what we're trying to do here. I wanted to bring up the possibility of maybe during this legislative session changing the law itself to add a definition that we've included in the guidelines already--some ideas of what innovative is. Maybe that will help clarify it better.

The other was the possibility of adding another member to the Council. I would suggest Steve Winham, Director of the State Office of Planning and Budget, because we do run into these questions of whether or not they've requested it before, whether or not they can use certain pots of money and that type of thing. He can provide the insight from the budget office that his analysts are providing to us. The analysts recommend funding based solely on the fact that it is not already in the budget or they've never requested it before – not looking at the guidelines completely. Steve has participated in several of the steering committees of the Undersecretaries group as it relates to IT. He has a total picture from a budget prospective.

B. Beyer: I support that.

Senator Greene: Until the change occurs, maybe Steve should sit in.

R. Austin: We can certainly make that request.

Senator Greene: Let's make that request and have his input. If we need it legislatively, we'll go on and try to change it.

R. Austin: What about the idea of amending the law to include some type of definition of innovative, what we're talking about when we say innovative use?

T. Hagan: I agree that it should be defined in some way.

R. Austin: We've changed the definition in the guidelines and we still ran into some of the same problems.

T. Hagan: There is new and emerging technology out there and I think those are the kinds of things that perhaps we envisioned initially when we came up with the idea of the IT

Fund. We're seeing over and over again one agency seeing another agency doing something and we're not doing it, so we think it's innovative and we're going to bring it forward. For example, the document management system. We've turned down at least three or four requests for that already.

B. Beyer: Maybe we should include on the Web page those that were funded, but also those that weren't funded and the reason why they were not funded.

R. Austin: We'll work on developing a separate Web Site for the Technology Fund. Before it is operational, we'll send it to the Council for their input. We will also include proposals that have been awarded and proposals that were rejected. We will send it to the Council members to review. Any other business?

T. Hagan moves for adjournment. B. Beyer seconds the motion. Meeting adjourned.